

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 were pending in this application. Claims 6 and 10-21 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claim 7 has been amended to better define the scope of the claimed invention.

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Examiner states that it is not apparent from the claim language what width the slits would be to meet the criteria of wide enough to interrupt electron flow, but not wide enough to significantly reduce thermal conduction. Applicant respectfully submits that the precise width will be dependent upon a number of factors, including the size of the chip mount pad, the magnitude of the current and magnetic field being measured, the heat dissipated by the chip, and so forth, a fact which would be apparent to one skilled in the art. Given the variability inherent in such a situation, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter to the extent that the subject matter allows. Therefore, the Examiner's decision to not consider the pertinent claim language as further limiting the structure referred to in Claims 1 and 8 is in error.

Claims 1, 5, 8, and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Manabe (U.S. Patent No. 4,797,726). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claims 1 and 8 include the feature of a "slit wide enough to interrupt electron flow in the pad plane, but not wide enough to significantly reduce thermal conduction in a direction normal to said pad plane." Manabe does not provide sufficient information to enable one to determine whether Manabe's structure meets the claim limitations or not. Manabe says nothing

about electron flow or thermal conduction before and after the formation of the plates separated by a gap. Since Manabe is deficient in anticipating all of the features of the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 9 depend from Claims 1 and 8 and are therefore allowable over Manabe by virtue of their dependence from a patentable base claim. In addition, Claim 9 states that the slits are configured such that the mechanical stability and thermal conduction of the leadframe is preserved. Manabe teaches away from the mechanical stability limitation. In Manabe's Figures 4A-4C, it is apparent that the gap in Manabe's leadframe increases, and that the bend angle of the bent portion of the readily deformable plate 10 changes during heating. Thus, Manabe's slits are not configured in such a way that the mechanical stability of the leadframe is preserved. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manabe. Claims 2 and 3 depend from Claim 1. Manabe does not teach or suggest all of the features of Claim 1, as argued above. Therefore, Claims 2 and 3 are patentable over Manabe at least by virtue of their dependence from a patentable base claim.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manabe and further in view of Brown (U.S. Patent No. 4,918,511). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Neither Manabe nor Brown provide anything to motivate the skilled artisan to combine the teachings of the two references. It is asserted in the Office Action that Brown teaches "the same useful technique described in Manabe" by stating at col. 2, lines 6-11 that having portions of the lead frame removed provides improved electrical and heat transfer characteristics. Applicant respectfully disagrees with that characterization of Brown's statement. Brown says at col. 2, lines 6-11 that "an improved integrated circuit package is provided comprising an integrated circuit

die bonded to a metal lead frame having portions of the lead frame beneath the die removed to provide stress relief for the balance of the leadframe in contact with the die." Thus, Brown does not teach a configuration for improving electrical and heat transfer characteristics as asserted. Therefore, in view of a lack of motivation in the references for a combination of the teachings thereof, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of Claims 1-5 and 7-9. If the Examiner has any questions or other correspondence regarding this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney at the below listed telephone number and address.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. Skrehot  
Reg. No. 36,682

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
P.O. Box 655474, M/S 3999  
Dallas, TX 75265  
Phone: 972 917-5653  
Fax: 972 917-4418